

10th August 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is :

'That the following names be added to the list of members of the Select Committee on the Malabar Tenancy Bill :—

*Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar,
Raja of Kallikote,
Kumararaja of Venkatagiri, and
The Zamindar of Seithur'*

The motion was put and lost.

The motion of the hon. the Revenue Member was put and adopted.

IV

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1929-30.

GRANT XXXI—CIVIL WORKS—TRANSFERRED.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Council will now resume discussion of the motion of Mr. Nagan Gowda."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Mr. President, I was saying yesterday that I wanted to know the policy on which the hon. the Minister has been proceeding in the matter of taking over roads formerly maintained by district boards. So far as I am able to see, I cannot find any reasonable or fair or equitable policy. Government have already taken over two roads in Malabar and they have proceeded now to take over this third one in the district of Coimbatore. The only policy I can see from my experience for the last one or two years in this respect seems to be a policy of racial discrimination, discrimination in the interests of a particular class for whom the Ministry have entertained feelings of favouritism. It is a case of favouring British vested interests, the European planting interest, whereas when the question of taking over certain roads which would benefit the Indian planters, the Government have flatly refused even a small grant of Rs. 15,000. It is, of course, said that the matter is under consideration and that for some technical reason or other it is being delayed. But in the present case, the Government come forward with alacrity and evident anxiety to take over the management of a road at enormous cost. Sir, it is common knowledge that the cost incurred by the Government through the Public Works Department on the maintenance of roads is far, far higher than that spent by district boards in that respect. In some case, I find that the Government have spent over Rs. 2,000 per mile. Yet they are reluctant to make a grant of Rs. 1,000 on this behalf to the district boards. On behalf of the district boards, I wish to assure the Government that any amount that Government are willing to grant is as a rule being carefully spent and the ordinary roads could be better maintained by the district boards at less cost. I submit therefore there is no reason why partiality should be shown to any particular road in this way. There must be some uniform policy based on reasonable grounds. Sir, we have got before us the report of the Committee on Road Development appointed by the Government of India under the chairmanship of Mr. Jayakar. Unfortunately, I was not able to get hold of a copy of it at the present time. It is available neither in the Council library nor in the Secretariat library. But I remember having read extracts from the report which would go to show the supreme necessity for a forward policy on the part of the Government in the matter of improvement of roads. I am really anxious that Government should take over certain class of roads which require extraordinary treatment but there should be a uniform policy to be followed.

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

[10th August 1929]

Why should not the Government take up the whole question of classification of roads and maintaining, some of them by district boards with the help of Government grants and others by Government?

"There is yet another point involved in this motion. I find that this motion is for the grant of a certain amount by the planters. I think in principle this sort of acceptance of a grant is unsound. Why should grants be made to Government to take over a road in the interests of a particular class, in this case the European planters. The Indian planters in South Kanara are ready to pay towards the cost of maintenance if the Government would take over a particular road under them for their benefit. The question again will be, how long will it be necessary to be making these grants, for how many years, for ten years, or will it be for ever? Even if the particular community or class offers to contribute, how is the obligation to be enforced, and under what law? It is evident that in the matter of spending money in the maintenance of roads, the Government have been pursuing a wrong policy. Irrespective of any class or community, the Government should pay particular attention to the condition of roads in the country. I would only suggest that the hon. Minister tours in the several parts of the country, not in cars provided for him but in his own cars, particularly in South Kanara and see for himself" . . .

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I cannot allow the hon. Member or the Minister to go in his car to South Kanara on this motion." (Laughter.)

12-30
P.m.

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I was only saying, Sir, that if the hon. the Minister tours in Coimbatore district and sees the condition of the roads for himself, he will see that it is the same everywhere except some few main roads. In some places our roads are in a bad condition. They cannot stand the great demand made by the traffic on account of motors, lorries, motor buses and so on. Besides there are other reasons also why the Government should take steps to improve our roads. The Postmaster-General refuses to sanction the conveyance of mails on buses because buses cannot be sure of a smooth journey. That is another reason why I want the Government to spend money on certain roads of importance, but I want that they should go on under a comprehensive and wide policy. I may mention, Sir, that the postal communication is another argument. The post could go by bus if the roads are in a good condition, but now there are no proper roads for safe and continuous traffic of buses . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am afraid the hon. Member's observations are not relevant."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I would appeal to the hon. the two Ministers concerned in this matter to withdraw this demand and bring before us another demand on a more comprehensive basis based on a sound policy. There should be a clear uniform policy underlying it. At present we are at a loss to know what policy the Government are going to follow. I am sure this House cannot be befooled to vote for this grant which the Government have brought forward with a short note which only bewilders us. Probably the Ministers are not aware of what they are doing. As for ourselves, we are groping in the dark in regard to these matters. I have been asked by my hon. Friends why I follow these obstructive tactics. Sir, are we not justified in making long speeches and pointing out the defects in all these matters? Here no doubt it is a small thing, but it has got connexion with the larger

10th August 1929]

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

question of Government arriving at some sound and uniform policy. With these words, I request the Government to withdraw this demand now."

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, with regard to the Pollachi-Vannanthurai road, the history of the case is briefly as follows. Till the year 1924 the District Board was maintaining this road at a cost of Rs. 771 per mile. The condition of the road was said to be very bad and various representations were made to the Government about the bad condition of the road. His Excellency the ex Governor Lord Goschen, visited this place, and at that time"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. The name of His Excellency cannot be introduced to influence the vote of the House." (Hear, hear.)

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I won't mention the name, Sir, but what he said was"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Whatever remarks His Excellency passed in connexion with this matter, I cannot allow the hon. the Minister to refer to here. "

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I am not referring to them, Sir, except to give it as one of the reasons"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is exactly the reason why it should not be mentioned. "

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Very well, Sir, as it is at present, the Government have control over the ghat road in the Anamalai hills. So this important connecting road also has to be taken over by the Government, mostly for the benefit of the coolies that are engaged in the plantations. As soon as the road was taken over in 1925 an estimate was prepared for reconstructing or reforming the road, but in that estimate provision was not made for the complete soling of the road because they did not want to spend the whole money all at once. They wanted to do the work bit by bit. Therefore some portion of the road has been reformed, and some portions, still left unsold. The Chief Engineer now reports that the remaining portions of the road are in a very bad condition and that unless they are repaired and improved immediately, the road will go to dogs. Therefore the Government have come up with this demand before the House.

"Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar says there are two proposals, one by the Provincial Railway Corporation with regard to the rutway, and the other the survey of a branch line by the South Indian Railway. I am not aware whether the Government have received any such proposal from the Provincial Railway Company with regard to the rutway or tramway. Even if it is carried out, I do not think it will be able to carry all the heavy traffic of the coolies engaged in these plantations. Even if there is the rutway, if there is to be a breakdown of that way, it will still be necessary to have the ghat road. With regard to the survey by the South Indian Railway, nothing is definitely known when the survey may begin, and it will certainly take a very long time to construct a branch line.

"Mr. Muniswami Nayudu raised some objections regarding the guarantee of the planters, regarding their contribution towards this work. I find from the Government Order on the subject that the Government asked the planters to pay a contribution of Rs. 200 a mile for a period of five years, and the whole question will be raised again. I have been asked to state

[Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar]

[10th August 1929]

whether the planters were given any concession in regard to this matter. I may say that no concession has been so given. They are treated just as the other passengers are treated.

"As regards the challenge made by the President of the Coimbatore District Board, the Chief Minister has already replied to it; that is about the handing over of this road and maintaining it in a proper condition. As it is, we are spending Rs. 1,000 per mile on this road, and this District Board pays Rs. 500. One of my hon. Friends said that the District Board did not propose to hand over this road. This road was taken over on the understanding that the District Board should pay Rs. 500, that the planters should pay Rs. 200 and the Government should spend Rs. 300, for each mile. Now, Sir, I want to say finally that this road has not been reformed for the planters, but for the coolies who are as much human beings as ourselves. For these reasons, I would ask the House to sanction this demand."

Mr. W. P. A. SUNDARAPANDIYAN:—"I move that the question be now put."

*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"In view of the light thrown by Mr Saldanha on the matter under discussion, I think I shall have to gauge the opinion of the House if the closure could be accepted. The question is that the question be now put."

The motion was declared lost. The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar demanded a poll, and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 35. Mr. S. Subrahmanya Moopanar. |
| 2. " Sir Thomas Moir. | 36. " D. Thomas. |
| 3. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 37. " S. V. Vanavudaiya Goundar. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 38. " S. Venkiah. |
| 5. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 39. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 40. " O. E. Wood. |
| 7. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 41. " A. J. Leech. |
| 8. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthalakshmi Reddi. | 42. " F. E. James. |
| 9. Mr. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. | 43. " H. E. P. Hearson. |
| 10. " Hilton Brown. | 44. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 11. " H. A. Watson. | 45. " S. Arpadaswami Udayar. |
| 12. " A. G. Leach. | 46. " K. Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 13. " J. Gray. | 47. " U. Ramaswami Ayyar. |
| 14. " S. V. Ramamurti. | 48. " G. R. Premayya. |
| 15. " C. B. Cotterell. | 49. " V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 16. " V. Ch. John. | 50. " C. Gopala Menon. |
| 17. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 51. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 18. " Syed Tajudin Sahib. | 52. Rao Bahadur O. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 19. " H. B. Ari Gowder. | 53. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 20. " A. B. Shetty. | 54. The Maharaja of Pithapuram. |
| 21. " J. Bheemayya. | 55. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 22. " R. Foulkes. | 56. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 23. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 57. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 24. " Mahmud Sehamnad Sahib. | 58. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 25. The Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 59. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 26. The Zamindar of Singampatti. | 60. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 27. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur. | 61. Mr. Khadir Mohideen Sahib. |
| 28. Mr. J. Kuppaswami. | 62. Khan Sahib T. M. Moida Sahib. |
| 29. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 63. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 30. " K. Krishnan. | 64. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 31. " N. Siva Raj. | 65. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 32. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 66. Raja of Kalkota. |
| 33. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | |
| 34. " W. P. A. Soundarapandian. | |

10th August 1929]

Nos.

1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju.
2. „ K. Koti Reddi.
3. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
4. „ S. Satyaanurti.
5. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
6. „ J. A. Saldanha.
7. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao.
8. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
9. „ Abdul Hameed Khan.
10. „ K. V. K. Swami.
11. „ D. Narayana Raja.
12. „ K. R. Karant.
13. „ K. Madhavan Nayar.
14. „ P. Anjaneyulu.
15. „ C. Obi Reddi.
16. „ A. Parasurama Rao.

17. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.
18. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.
19. „ Ahmed Miran Sahib.
20. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
21. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
22. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
23. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
24. „ B. Venkataratnam.
25. „ C. Venkatraman Nayudu.
26. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
27. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
28. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
29. „ R. Nagan Gowda.
30. „ C. E. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.

Ayes 66

Nos 30.

The motion was carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question is to reduce the allotment of Rs. 500 by Re. 1.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA :—“Sir, I move—

‘that the allotment of Rs. 500 for Civil Works—Transferred be reduced by Re. 1.’

Sir, I want by means of this motion to find out from the Government whether they have received any preliminary report on the irrigation schemes in the Trichinopoly district that are proposed to be investigated by the proposed special division. If so, I would like to have that report placed on the table of the House. The reasons why I ask that this report should be placed on the table of the House are the following.

“Sir, the explanatory note that has been placed in the hands of Members of this honourable House shows that this work regarding the investigation of irrigations in the Trichinopoly district was taken on hand as recently as January 1929. Sir, I would like to make only one statement and it is this, that there are a great many schemes that have been pending in places where irrigation is much more necessary and greatly needed and where numerous requests for the investigation of schemes have been made for years, and in regard to which the preliminary reports and estimates have been awaiting the sanction of the Government.

“Sir, in a district like Trichinopoly, where irrigation is well developed, where as many as 150,000 acres or more are under channel irrigation, not to speak of the area that is under well irrigation, in a district like that, they have started an investigation just four or five months ago, and now they have come forward with a supplementary demand for it. Have they thought of the Tungabhadra project investigation, for which Bellary and other poor districts have been crying for long? 12-15 P.M.

“There is another important thing that I would like to press upon this House as a reason for my asking that the preliminary report on the irrigation schemes should be placed on the table of the House, and there is a very important principle involved in it. The question of the apportionment

[Mr. R. Nagan Gowda]

[10th August 1929]

of the waters of the river Cauvery among the districts of Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Coimbatore and Salem yet remains to be decided, and now, Sir, without the preliminary report being placed before this House, it would be doing an injustice to these districts to investigate the schemes, especially when Salem has been complaining of water scarcity and drought has been prevalent there very often. If those districts do not know what the scheme includes, it will be doing an injustice to them.

"Sir, I should like to have an idea of the returns that are likely to be obtained from these projects. Whenever we ask for an irrigation scheme in some of our poor districts like Bellary, they say, 'that scheme does not produce adequate returns, it would get only 2 or 3 per cent, and that is not enough.' Even a 4 per cent return is not enough for them. So, I should like to know whether this scheme is productive of a higher percentage, before I give my vote for this grant.

"There is the question of the restoration of the old course of the Uyyakondan channel, and that is a very important matter. If it is going to be restored, what the effect of it will be on the lands adjoining, and other things will have to be considered. Therefore, I propose that this grant be reduced by Re. 1."

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"Mr. President, Sir, I understand the hon. Mover of the amendment desires to have a preliminary report to be placed before the House, on the irrigation schemes which are going to be investigated. It is true that a subdivision was sanctioned about the last March for the work. It is now proposed to add some extra works to this subdivision for investigation, and it is considered desirable that it should be placed in charge of an Executive Engineer. I will certainly take into consideration the suggestion of the hon. Member that a preliminary report should be obtained, especially with reference to the high level channel, and placed at the disposal of the House."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—"Mr. President, Sir, various schemes have been put forward by the Government occasionally without any consideration as to the relative merits or the relative necessity of such schemes, in various districts. It is more than three years since the Ceded Districts Irrigation Committee sent in its report, in which various recommendations for the improvement of irrigation sources have been suggested. Mr. President, you know that many a time here, the previous Law Member had given us such splendid and wonderful promises that, in spite of the serious famines that we have been having for the last twenty or thirty years, our spirits were raised to such a high pitch that we expected our position to be much bettered in the course of two or three years. What is the result, Sir? Government comes forward with schemes and supplementary demands for large amounts of money for other districts but with nothing for our districts. Now, a number of schemes in the Ceded districts are to be investigated, for which the ordinary staff is not adequate but requires a special staff. But Government has made no serious attempts to investigate those schemes." I do not know if the Government want to shelve those schemes, or whether they really want to do anything in the matter."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"Is the hon. Member in order in referring to the schemes of other districts?"

10th August 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"As far as I understand the gist of his speech is, that the Government have not been impartial but have been partial to some districts."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Sir, that is the construction we are obliged to put on the attitude of the Government. While the Council and the Government have recognized the necessity for improving the irrigation in our districts long ago, and when it is well known that our districts have been seriously suffering from famine once in two or three years, that the Government should try to evade the whole situation and not even appoint special staff to make the investigation is a matter of great disappointment to us."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is better the hon. Member comes to the demand first. He has sufficiently dwelt on his own district. If every Member were to go on with his own district, there would be very little discussion on the real issues."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"Mr. President, our complaint is merely that Government has recognized the necessity for improving the irrigation in our districts and that we are suffering very much now from famines and as such, we legitimately claim that Government should pay attention first to our districts, instead of trying to go on with other districts which are not in such a bad position. Let the Government do what they can for them. On the other hand, it is my belief that most irrigation schemes pay in any district. For schemes put forward in our districts, Government for some reason or other say 'this is not productive or that is not feasible', and under all sorts of excuses they have not made any serious attempt to alleviate the situation in our districts. Sir, the Irrigation Committee's report consists of 33 pages, and whatever might be the number of recommendations made by the Committee, the Government have not paid proper attention . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is not justified in going through the details of that report."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I only want to point out the number of schemes which the Government have before them, which if executed, will alleviate the suffering to a large extent in our districts. For this purpose, it is absolutely necessary that some special staff ought to be appointed. The staff that is already existing is absolutely inadequate for the purpose of carrying out the recommendations made. Now it is absolutely necessary to have special staff for the restoration of tanks, for the cutting of supply channels to various tanks and for various other schemes. It is high time, Sir, that at least the Tungabhadra project is taken up and executed at once in the interests of the Ceded districts. One of the recommendations which the Ceded Districts Irrigation Committee made is to take the water from the main canal to the Dharmavaram and Anantapur taluks. For that purpose, a canal has to be made, and that is a new feature not included in the scheme of Mackenzie and therefore requires immediate investigation."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I consider that a description of the various schemes that are neglected by the Government will not be relevant to this discussion."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I only say that in view of the urgent necessity for improving the irrigation sources in our districts and in view of the

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[10th August 1929]

neglect that the Government has so far shown in the matter of not appointing any special staff to make proper investigation of the various schemes that have been recommended, it is very difficult on our part to make up our minds to vote for this expenditure. So, I am bound to say that some special staff ought to have been appointed for the investigation of the schemes recommended by the Ceded Districts Committee."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I cannot allow the hon. Member to further develop that argument."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—"I hope, Sir, that the present Law Member will see that a special staff is at once appointed in order to investigate the various schemes that have been proposed by the Ceded Districts Irrigation Committee."

* Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, I certainly sympathise with the position taken up by my hon. Friends, Mr. Nagan Gowda and Mr. Koti Reddi, in relation to their districts. If they want something for their districts and if irrigation facilities in their districts have to be improved, we certainly will vote for them. But I cannot understand their attitude in trying to vote against a demand relating to our district. Mr. Nagan Gowda has depicted the position of our district in rather too bright colours. It is not true that we are having such irrigation facilities as Mr. Nagan Gowda says we have. It is not true that we have a lakh and fifty thousand acres under channel irrigation. Some glamour is always attached to the position of the Trichinopoly district. We have oftentimes cried in this Council for redress, and that will show the extent of the grief we are immersed in, rather than the extent of the relief which has been given to us.

"The present demand is only to put under the charge of an Executive Engineer what has already been committed to the care of a subdivisional officer. Government now finds that one subdivisional officer is not enough to investigate four schemes, as mentioned in the explanatory note, and I am bound to say that all these four schemes are absolutely necessary for our district; in fact they are long overdue. The Uyyakondan channel, which alone is irrigating about 20,000 acres, has long been neglected, and it has been said that it was irrigating in old days a larger extent than it has been doing now.

1 p.m. "If by the restoration of the old course more lands could be brought under cultivation easily with less expenditure, I do not understand why other Members of the Council ought to be against such restoration.

"With regard to the second, namely, the extension of the proposed high level channel from the Kattalai South Bank canal, I think the latter part of the argument used by Mr. Nagan Gowda is an argument in favour of the investigation of the scheme completely. He said that there must be an equitable distribution of water under the Mettur scheme among all the districts concerned, namely, Coimbatore, Trichinopoly, Salem and Tanjore, and if so, the second scheme is one which is intended to carry out that object. Therefore on that account I submit that Mr. Nagan Gowda ought not to vote against this grant.

"In the case of Thottiam Chinna Voikal, this kind of redress is necessitated by the action of the Government. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, the head of this voikal was in a better place, and on the advice of the then

10th August 1929] [Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai]

engineering subordinates the head had been shifted to the present place. It is found from actual experience that the voikal does not work properly. It is silted up. And there are constant and persistent complaints with regard to the supply of this channel. Now, the idea is to shift this head should be some two miles further up, viz., to its old place. This has been pending for the last four or five years. Even in 1924 there was an estimate for a lakh of rupees to shift this head of the voikal to Vayalur. Though five years had elapsed, it is still in the stage of investigation, and is this a thing to excite the envy of hon. Members from other districts? Let them clearly realize our pitiable position.

“There is a scheme to be introduced under the Tungabhadra project. They could on that score deprive us of the water from the voikal which has been in existence for long but which has been neglected by the Public Works Department for over a decade.

“Then coming to the improvements necessary to the Peruvai channel, it is an important channel and there has often been a complaint that at the tail end there has been no water-supply. I should like to enter into details, but unhappily the time at my disposal is very short. So, I will cut short the discussion and request Mr. Nagan Gowda and Mr. Koti Reddi to withdraw their own amendments. It is not true to say that our position is very enviable. If we come here often and pray for relief, it is because we have not been given it. Therefore, I oppose the amendment of Mr. Nagan Gowda.”

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“Mr. President, I am sorry that this again is a token motion. Projects in a whole district are being taken up. In January 1929, we are told, a special subdivision was sanctioned by the Government and it was part of a special programme contemplated; the second of the schemes now on paper was to cultivate 10,000 acres; and later on representations were made that 50,000 acres could be brought under cultivation. The Government decided to investigate both these schemes, the smaller and the larger, and also all the connected schemes in the district. I must congratulate, Sir, the Trichinopoly district on having its representative on the treasury bench, however disadvantageous that has been to the other parts of the country. It is particularly significant that whoever occupies the Treasury Bench has had the good fortune of serving either his own interest or the interests of his locality. The scheme which has been so long pending fruition and which is now in operation with regard to Tanjore, was the production of a Law Member who belonged to that district. The investigation into the Trichinopoly project is the result of the occupancy right of an hon. Minister, not the Law Member, on the Treasury Bench. It looks as though the Government of Madras has entered into a compact with the members on the Treasury Bench to serve the interests of the particular localities that they represent. I have no grievance if the ryots of the Trichinopoly district get some more water. But it is up to the Government, situated as it is in this country, and situated as the people are, to consider the claims all round and make up their mind as to the programme that they should take up. It is a wonder that the Government previously sanctions some things, then after six months make up its mind to come to this House on a token motion, and ask for a grant and that for a very large grant indeed. I am very sorry that this kind of business is being done in the Public Works Department.

[Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao] [10th August 1929]

"I want to draw attention especially of the hon. the Revenue Member to this aspect of the question. He ought to set right the house of the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department as I have already said, I do not want to dilate upon it, has become irresponsible on account of plenty of money in its possession."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member, I think, is only repeating the arguments of yesterday."

* MR. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"I draw the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member to the fact that I have stated, namely, the irresponsible way in which the Public Works Department is capable of spending the moneys in its possession. We have a large number of demands to make on the attention of the Government and it is necessary that the Government should conserve its resources and spend them in a judicious manner. It would not have been probably so very difficult for this House to understand this demand if the Trichinopoly district were not well provided already. There is no question that the Trichinopoly district does not require more or deserve more. I do not want to discuss that question at all. It may be possible that Trichinopoly deserves more, it may be possible that Trichinopoly has capacities to do more in the matter of agriculture. I have not the slightest desire to discuss those questions. But what I do want to discuss is this, that it is incumbent on the Government to examine the needs of the whole Presidency to find out which is the most needy. As a matter of fact, once in three years, there are parts of the Presidency like the district to which I belong which are stricken with famine. This year, the prospects in our district are very bad and as such, attention should be paid more to the localities that are in great need of water and facilities for irrigation than the others. Instead of that, day in and day out, we have some demand or other on the floor of the House to feed the already well-fed district of Tanjore or Trichinopoly. He that hath is given more; but he that hath not is deprived of the little that he hath. That is the principle adopted by this Government. I therefore feel that a demand like this—though it would be graceless on my part to oppose it and say that Trichinopoly shall not have any more water, a demand like this cannot help producing the impression upon the people of this country that Government is neglecting the more needy populations of the Presidency and feeding those who have already enough."

"I know, Sir, that the Government has been promising a number of things. I know also that mention was made of the investigation that is being carried on in regard to the Thungabhadra project. But I equally know that there are a large number of miscellaneous demands, a large number of miscellaneous irrigation sources which without the Thungabhadra project would be of use to the districts that require irrigation most; and these large number of demands are never met. They are merely brushed aside as things that need not be looked into because they do not pay the Government very heavy returns. As long as this policy is followed we cannot help standing against demands like this and crying for water as representatives from the most waterless tracts of the Presidency. I feel therefore the hon. the Revenue Member will do well before launching into this expenditure to examine the whole needs of the Presidency; and if this expenditure might be undertaken in addition to what is most needed to meet the necessary demands of other districts, I should certainly have no objection to his investigating in a wholesale manner the necessities of the

10th August 1929] [Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO]

Trichinopoly district. It is not one project that is contemplated here; one project is connected with another, and the second is connected with a third, and the third with a fourth and so on, and the schemes of the whole district are under investigation under this grant. I therefore feel that this grant cannot be so easily supported by the representatives of the poorer portions of the Presidency."

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"Sir, my position in the Cabinet has nothing to do with this scheme. It is not a new matter. On account of the floods in 1924, the head sluices of several channels in the district were damaged and irrigation was considerably handicapped. Some head sluices were reconstructed and some proposals regarding the bed regulator, etc., are still pending. Now that the question of the improvements to the several channels in the district are under consideration, the needs of the whole district have to be considered. Meanwhile the irrigation schemes for Salem and other places came up for investigation I mean the Mettur Project. There is a number of schemes which have to be taken on hand when the area is surveyed. I have only to say that I agree to the proposals. I have no idea of opposing any grants for other districts. These have nothing to do with my position in the Cabinet. With these words, I appeal to the House to support this grant."

Mr. W. P. A. SOUNDARAPANDIAN :—"I move that the question be now put."

The motion was put and declared carried.

Mr. S. Satyamurti demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

1-15
p.m.

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 30. Mr. W. P. A. Soundarapandian. |
| 2. " Sir Thomas Moir. | 31. " S. Subrahmanya Mooppanar. |
| 3. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krfshnan Nayar. | 32. " Daniel Thomas. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 33. " S. Venkiah. |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 34. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 35. Mr. A. J. Leech. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 36. " E. E. James. |
| 8. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 37. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 9. Mr. Hilton Brown. | 38. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 10. " H. A. Watson. | 39. Raja of Kallikota. |
| 11. " A. G. Leach. | 40. Mr. U. Ramaswami Ayyar. |
| 12. " J. Gray. | 41. " V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 13. " S. V. Ramamurti | 42. " P. Siva Rao. |
| 14. " C. B. Cotterell. | 43. The Maharaja of Pithapuram. |
| 15. " V. Ch. John. | 44. Mr. C. Gopala Menon. |
| 16. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 45. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 17. Syed Tjudin Sahib Bahadur. | 46. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 18. Mr. A. B. Shetty. | 47. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 19. " J. Bheemayya. | 48. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 20. " R. Foulkes. | 49. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 21. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 50. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razaek Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur. | 51. Muhammad Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 52. Khan Sahib T. M. Moideoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 53. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 25. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 54. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murgappa Chettiyar. |
| 26. " K. Krishnan. | 55. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 27. " N. Siva Raj. | |
| 28. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | |
| 29. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | |

[10th August 1929]

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 16. Mr. A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 2. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 17. „ C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 3. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 18. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. „ S. Satyamurti. | 19. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 20. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 21. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 22. Mr. Mothay Narayana Rao. |
| 8. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 23. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. |
| 9. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 24. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 25. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 11. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 26. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 12. „ K. R. Karant. | 27. „ R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 13. „ K. Madhavan Nayar. | 28. „ C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 14. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | |
| 15. „ C. Obi Reddi. | |

Ayes 55. Noes 28.

The motion was carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I will now put the motion of Mr. Nagan Gowda to reduce the allotment of Rs. 500 for Civil Works—Transferred by Re. 1.”

The motion was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 16. Mr. K. R. Karant. |
| 2. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 17. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 3. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 4. „ S. Satyamurti. | 19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 5. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 20. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 21. Mr. Mothay Narayana Rao. |
| 7. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 22. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. |
| 8. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 23. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 10. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 25. Mr. Ramanath Goenka. |
| 11. „ K. Madhavan Nayar. | 26. „ Raman Menon. |
| 12. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 27. „ R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 13. „ C. Obi Reddi. | 28. „ C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 14. „ A. Parasurama Rao. | |
| 15. „ C. Ramasomayajulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Mr. S. V. Ramamurti. |
| 2. „ Sir Thomas Moir. | 14. „ C. B. Cotterell. |
| 3. „ Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 15. „ V. Ch. John. |
| 4. „ Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 16. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 5. „ Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 17. Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. „ Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 18. Mr. A. B. Shetty. |
| 7. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 19. „ J. Bheemayya. |
| 8. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 20. „ R. Foulkes. |
| 9. Mr. Hilton Brown. | 21. „ P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. |
| 10. „ H. A. Watson. | 22. Mahamud Sahamud Sahib Bahadur. |
| 11. „ A. G. Leach. | 23. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 12. „ J. Gray. | 24. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. |
| | 25. „ T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| | 26. „ K. Krishnan. |

10th August 1929]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 27. Mr. N. Siva Raj. | 43. Mr. C. Gopala Menon. |
| 28. „ M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 44. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 29. „ V. I. Moniswami Pillai. | 45. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 30. „ W. P. A. Soundarapandian. | 46. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 31. „ S. Subrahmanya Moopanar. | 47. Mr. P. U. Rajan. |
| 32. „ D. Thomas. | 48. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 33. „ S. Venkiah. | 49. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Kazaak Sahib Bahadur. |
| 34. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. | 50. Muhammad Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 35. Mr. A. J. Leech. | 51. Khan Sahib T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 36. „ E. E. James. | 52. Rao Bahadur B. Moniswami Nayudu. |
| 37. „ S. N. Dorai Raja. | 53. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 38. „ S. Arpudawami Udayar. | 54. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 39. Raja of Kallikota. | |
| 40. Mr. U. Ramaswami Ayyar. | |
| 41. „ V. Ramjee Rao. | |
| 42. „ P. Siva Rao. | |

Neutral.

1. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 2. The Maharaja of Pithapuram.

Ayes 28. Noes 54. Neutral 2.

The motion was lost.

* Mr. 8. SATYAMURTI:—“Mr. President, Sir, we are now dealing with a kind of demand which consists of so many sub-heads. I quite recognize Mr. President that under the existing constitution, the allocation of the various heads and sub-heads under these demands is entirely in the hands of the Finance Department. But I would like to invite the attention of this House, Mr. President to this fact that this demand of Rs. 500 consists of five items for each one of which Rs. 100 are asked for as token demands. Some of these items are good, some are bad and some are indifferent; and I think it is less than fair to this House that all these demands should be put together and the House asked to vote for them.

“My second point, Mr. President, is that the new rule authorizing the Government to put forward token demands before the House in order to get an expression of opinion of this House to the policy underlying those token demands is being rather freely taken advantage of by the authorities. It was intended, I presume, Sir, for large questions of policy with regard to financial commitments of which the Government would not be in a position to state accurately in terms of rupees, annas and pies, but with regard to which they wanted a general sanction of the House for the policy underlying that expenditure. I should have expected, Sir, that a rule like that would have been very sparingly used by the Government. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. President, I think it has become latterly a habit of this Government to truncate even the otherwise limited financial powers of this Honourable House by resorting freely to this process of submitting token demands.

“Sir, moreover, if the House will examine these schemes one by one, they will find that there is no clear need made out for these demands not having been included in the budget which was presented to the House in March this year. The House has got to be satisfied that certain new circumstances have arisen since the passing of the budget by this House, which

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[10th August 1929]

could not have been foreseen at the time the budget was framed, and in respect of which the Government are compelled to resort to what should be the extraordinary course of putting forward supplementary demands, or, there should have been a need for a new service arising in the course of the year which could not have been foreseen.

"Sir, I hope to satisfy this Honourable House that in respect of none of these items can the Government plead that these requirements could not have been foreseen when they framed the budget for this year. Taking item '(a) Additional establishment required in connexion with repairs and improvements to roads in the West Coast to be carried out by the Public Works Department', this is what the explanatory note says: 'The Calicut-Vayittiri-Gudalur road and the Calicut-Gudalur or Nadghani Ghat road under the Malabar district having fallen into a state of disrepair. . . I should like to know when these roads fell into disrepair and when this matter was brought to the notice of the Government. If these roads fell into disrepair sometime last year, when was this matter brought to the notice of the Government? Unless the Government can state that the matter was not brought before them till after the time for including this item in the budget had passed, I submit to the House that the Government would have no right to come to us with a supplementary demand for this purpose.

"Then, Sir, the explanatory note goes on to say, 'the Government have ordered that the execution of special repairs to the roads should be undertaken by the Public Works Department and finished as early as possible.' Now, Sir, I should like to know what is the policy—if the Government has any policy—in regard to this matter. Some of these roads are taken up by the Public Works Department and some are left to the District Boards themselves. What are the peculiar circumstances of Malabar which render it necessary that these two roads should be taken up or ordered to be taken up by the Public Works Department? Moreover, Sir, does the district board make any contribution and does the Government propose to do these special repairs for the benefit of the Malabar district board without getting from that board any contribution at all?

"The explanatory note again goes on to say: 'The cost of the repairs to both the roads is now estimated by the Public Works Department at Rs. 3,53,000—Rs. 2,80,000 for the Vayittiri road and Rs. 73,000 for the Nadghani Ghat road.' The earlier sentence in the note, however, points out that the Government disallowed the extra demand. Now, what has happened since, for the Government to change its opinion? Further on, the note says 'It is proposed to sanction the employment of two temporary clerks and a draughtsman for the West Coast Division and one clerk for the Nilgiris Subdivision of the Coimbatore division to the end of the year. The extra cost involved can be met by reappropriation.' On that matter, I want to say one word. Sir, you have got to be satisfied or at least the House has got to be satisfied when a demand like this is made not only by a statement of the Government that the demand can be met by reappropriation, but also that the reappropriation is going to be made from this sub-head to that sub-head or from this major head to that major head. No such details are forthcoming with regard to this demand.

1-30
p.m.

"Therefore, Sir, on these two grounds, viz. that the financial implications of the proposals are not before the House, and even to the extent to which they are before the House, they are indefinite and inconclusive, and also

10th August 1929]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

because Government have not placed their cards on table of the House as to what is their policy with regard to taking these roads from the district boards and maintaining them themselves, and if so, what is the proportion of the cost which the district board and the Government should bear for the maintenance or construction of these roads, I think this part of the demand should be opposed."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Council will now adjourn and re-assemble at 2-30 p.m."

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.).

V

DURATION OF THE CURRENT SITTING OF THE COUNCIL.

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Mr. President, as we are not making progress with regard to the agenda as we anticipated and as we have many other Bills for the next meeting on behalf of the Government I request you to continue the sittings on Monday so that we may finish the business. If necessary, I may request you, Sir, again on Monday to continue the sitting in case we have not finished the business."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATHI RAJU :—"Mr. President, we have already sat nearly for one week. You were pleased to announce yesterday that the Council would close this evening and on the strength of that statement some of my friends have left the place and many more have booked or reserved their berths. Some other members of my party have got other engagements to attend to on Monday. Therefore it would be very inconvenient for my party and they asked me to request you to adjourn the Council to-day as it would be inconvenient if the sitting is continued."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Regarding the point that some members may be put to unnecessary expenditure I think the Government will be prepared to examine the question whether if any Members have incurred any expenditure on account of the announcement yesterday they should be reimbursed or not. The disposal of work before us is necessary and the Legislative machinery must be available for the Government to dispose of their business. I think that there is no reason for refusing to continue the sittings. After all what I announced yesterday was only for the convenience of hon. Members and till the actual moment when an adjournment is announced, the sittings continue and information might be given to Members from time to time as to the intentions of Government."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATHI RAJU :—"It is not on account of financial considerations that I made these representations."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have already asked the Secretary to wire to those Members who have left the place."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATHI RAJU :—"With regard to the disposal of the business, His Excellency the Governor has got other means of finishing it off. He can summon the Council ten or fifteen days earlier in September instead of in the latter part of September."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"As far as the continuance of this sitting is concerned, until the actual adjournment is announced, its continuance cannot be said to be illegal."